

**From:** Diane Engles  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/26/02 7:49pm  
**Subject:** Comment on Proposed Settlement

To Whom It May Concern:

I welcome the opportunity to comment on the proposed settlement between the Department of Justice and Microsoft. I am a software developer with over 17 years of industry experience. Over these years I have watched my choices of software development platforms and products decline in number and in quality, due almost entirely to the monopolistic practices of the Microsoft Corporation.

I watch daily and suffer myself as the poor quality of Microsoft's products cause American Industry to lose significant productivity due to system hangups virus infections. The current security flaws revealed in Windows XP are another example of a corporation who produces low quality products because there is no real competition. More secure and robust software exists today, but there is no real marketplace due to Microsoft's years of monopolistic practices.

In my opinion, the proposed settlement will do little to effectively curb Microsoft and allow a true marketplace and real innovation to develop.

I fully support the Kegel letter's (<http://www.kegel.com/remedy/letter.html>) proposed remedies to effectively remedy Microsoft's years of illegal monopolistic control of the marketplace and the resulting stifling of true innovation. I will mention two of them briefly here:

1) Microsoft's APIs, file formats, and protocols.

The complete documentation for these must be made public. Any future changes must also be made public in a timely manner. This should allow other companies to produce products that can compete with Microsoft's products by removing a major barrier to entry, namely that no company can afford to convert all of its existing documents into a new format in order to take advantage of a non-Microsoft office suite or other applications.

2) Microsoft's business practices.

Microsoft must not be allowed to enter into deals with OEMs, ISPs, or other businesses that would create disincentives or prohibit those companies from offering non-Microsoft products or services to their customers. Since the vast majority of the desktop computing world currently uses Microsoft products, OEMs, ISPs, and others must be able to offer those products to consumers. To allow Microsoft to continue to take advantage of that situation by prohibiting those companies from offering alternatives, either

by outright prohibition, or by economic disincentive, is to allow Microsoft to continue to hold the industry hostage.

Sincerely,

Diane F. Engles